

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Further to the written Response filed May 1, 2009, the present Amendment is in further response to the final Office Action mailed February 2, 2009 and addresses allegations made in the Advisory Action dated May 15, 2009 in the above-identified application.

Claims 2-17 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claims 2-4, 6-15 and 17 are amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by Applicant's disclosure, see, for example, Fig. 1 and Specification, paragraph 5, with respect to the amendment to claim 17.

#### ***Further Remarks Regarding the Patentability of Claims 15 and 17***

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Coyne et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,943,619. Further, claims 2-5, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Coyne et al. in view of Alperovich et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,356.

The arguments presented in the written Response filed on May 1, 2009 are believed to be fully responsive to these rejections. However, in view of the allegations made in the Advisory Action dated May 15, 2009, the following further comments are provided.

Claim 15 requires a contracted service module connected between the gateway and the home network, and a second data storage unit connected between the gateway and the home network, the contracted service module configured to provide the contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network by referring to the features data stored in the second data storage unit to determine whether the mobile subscriber unit is capable of receiving the contracted advanced services in the foreign network.

Further, claim 17 requires a contracted service unit connected between the gateway and the home network, and a second data storage unit connected between the gateway and the home network, the contracted service module configured to provide the contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network by referring to the features data stored in the second data storage unit to determine whether the mobile subscriber unit is capable of receiving the contracted advanced services in the foreign network.

First, as discussed in the written Response filed May 1<sup>st</sup>, according to an aspect of Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 15 and 17, the event-based service generated by event generator 11 of the home network can be provided to the mobile subscriber visiting the foreign

network because the module 9 consults second data storage unit 7 to determine whether the subscriber is located in a foreign network that is capable of providing such features.

In order to avoid burdening the Examiner with repeating comments made on pages 3 and 4 in the written Response filed May 1<sup>st</sup>, Applicant notes merely that Coyne does not disclose or suggest a contracted service module connected between the gateway and the home network to provide the contracted advance services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network, as required by claim 17. As explained more fully in that written Response, Coyne discloses instead that the protocol enhancer 250, as well as the NSC/VLR, are provided in the visited network 10B.

Further, Coyne does not disclose or suggest providing contracted advance services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network by referring to the features data stored in the second data storage unit connected between the gateway and the home network, as further required by claim 17. That is, Coyne is concerned with providing services to roaming mobile subscriber 30 by visitor network 10B, and in particular, providing services to MS30 not provided by the home network 10B. Coyne discloses that the HLR50 and other units of home network 10A have no information about what features may be provided to roaming NS30 by visited network 10B.


Alperovich does not cure these deficiencies of Coyne. Accordingly, Coyne, and Coyne and Alperovich taken together in combination, do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claims 15 and 17.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims of the application are respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON **July 29, 2009**

RCF:GB/jl

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber  
Registration No. 24,322  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700